

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/648,735	08/26/2003	Ricky D. Snyder	10003772-5	4698	
75	590 07/22/2004		EXAMINER		
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			PHAM, LONG		
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 7599			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2814		
Loveland, CO 80537-0599			DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004	DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/648,735	SNYDER ET AL.	G N		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Long Pham	2814			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this cor D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E			merits is		
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
D)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 August 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	Stage		
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/648,735 Page 2

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McTeer (US 5,700,718).

With respect to claim 1, McTeer teaches a method of constructing a metallization structure on a preexisting dielectric layer 14 of an integrated circuit during fabrication of the integrated circuit, the method comprising the steps of :

depositing a layer 16 of titanium onto the preexisting dielectric layer of the integrated circuit, fig. 2 and associated text;

depositing a layer 18 of aluminum onto the layer of titanium, fig.3 and associated text;

heating the integrated circuit sufficiently to cause the layer of titanium to become alloyed with the layer of aluminum, texts of cols. 5 and 6 of McTeer; and

further heating the integrated circuit to cure any defects.

McTeer teaches further heating the integrated circuit but fails to teach doing the heating at 400 degrees C for about 45 minutes.

However, since McTeer teaches the further heating for curing the defects, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of making

Art Unit: 2814

semiconductor devices to determine the workable or optimal value for the heating temperature and duration through routine experimentation and optimization to obtain optimal curing of defects because the heating temperature and duration are result-effective variables and there is no evidence indicating that they are critical or produce any unexpected results and it has been held that it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges of a result-effective variable within given prior art conditions by routine experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05.

With respect to claim 2, McTeer further teaches that the heating results in complete alloy of titanium and aluminum layers. See texts of cols. 5 and 6 of McTeer

With respect to claim 3, it would have been obvious to one of <u>ordinary skill</u> in the art of making semiconductor devices to determine the workable or optimal range for the thickness of the titanium layer through routine experimentation and optimization to obtain optimal or desired device performance because the thickness of the titanium layer is a result-effective variable and there is no evidence indicating that it is critical or produces any unexpected results and it has been held that it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges of a result-effective variable within given prior art conditions by routine experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05.

With respect to claim 4, McTeer further teaches depositing a layer 24 of titanium-nitride onto the layer of aluminum. fig. 6 and associated text.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Long Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-1714. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax

Application/Control Number: 10/648,735 Page 4

Art Unit: 2814

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Long Pham

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2814